

Response  
Serial No. 10/023,621  
Page 7

### **REMARKS**

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-38 are pending in the application, claims 1-31 are allowed and that claims 32-38 stand rejected. By this response claims 32-38 are cancelled to place the present application in condition for allowance and not in response to prior art. All other claims are un-amended by this response.

In view of the above amendments and the following discussion, the Applicant respectfully submits that all of these claims now satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Thus, the Applicant believes that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

### **Objections**

#### **A. Amendment to Specification**

The Examiner objected to the amendment filed on 9/14/04 under 35 U.S.C. 132 alleging that the amendment introduces new matter into the disclosure of the invention that is not supported by the original disclosure. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the limitations "it is to be understood that a torque produced by the weight of the electronic and optic components is substantially supported by the case 10" and "the cap 50 is pressure fit into the cavity 32" are not supported by the original disclosure.

In response, the Applicant has cancelled the portions of the amendments made to the Specification by the amendment filed on 9/14/04 objected to by the Examiner.

Having made these changes, the Applicant respectfully submits that the basis for the Examiner's objection to the Applicant's Specification has been removed. As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiners objection to the Specification be withdrawn.

316368-1

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Response  
Serial No. 10/023,621  
Page 8

### Rejections

#### **A. 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Examiner rejected claims 32-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner alleges that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. More specifically, the Examiner alleges that the new limitations in claims 32-38 are not supported by the original disclosure.

In response, the Applicant has herein cancelled claims 32-38 from the present application in order to place the above identified application in condition for allowance. The Applicant however does not concede that the original disclosure does not support claims 32-38 and reserves the right to file and prosecute claims 32-38 in a subsequent continuing application.

### Allowed Claims

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that the Applicant's claims 1-31 are allowable and for the Examiner's assistance in the furtherance of this application.

### Conclusion

Thus the Applicant respectfully submits that all of these claims now satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Consequently, the Applicant believes that all of these claims are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.


If however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Jorge Tony Villabon, Esq. at (732)

316368-1

Response  
Serial No. 10/023,621  
Page 9

530-9404 x 1131 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,



Kin-Wah Tong, Attorney  
Reg. No. 39,400

Dated: 11/15/04

MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP  
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100  
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702  
732-530-9404 - Telephone  
732-530-9808 - Facsimile

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**